REMARKS

Applicant hereby files this amendment with respect to non-initialed references cited upon a previously filed IDS, the statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter, and to submit a Substitute Drawing Request.

Regarding the IDS, Applicant submits herewith a copy of an IDS previously filed which includes references cited upon an accompanying form PTO-1449 which have not been initialed by the Examiner. Applicant requests initialization of the references and return of the initialed form to Applicant. Applicant notes that the attachment box for an IDS on the Notice of Allowance was checked but no PTO-1449 accompanied the Notice of Allowance.

Page 2 of the Notice of Allowance contains statements of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicant objects to and disagrees with such statements as including language not included in Applicant's claims. The patent statutes require claims to be presented and interpreted in accordance with what the Applicants regard as their invention. Accordingly, the claims must be read as Applicants regard them (as they are worded). The statements (e.g., see statements with respect to claim 21 in one example) as currently worded might be interpreted later as reading limitations into Applicants' claims which simply are not there. Applicant regards aspects of his invention as defined by the claims.

MPEP §1302.14 (8th ed.) states, in part, that where specific reasons are recorded by the examiner, *care must be taken to ensure that such reasons are accurate, precise, and do not place unwarranted interpretations, whether broad*

PAGE 4/12 * RCVD AT 3/4/2004 1:06:55 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:5098383424 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-24

or narrow, upon the claims. The examiner should keep in mind the possible misinterpretations of his or her statement that may be made and its possible estoppel effects.

In accordance with the above, the Examiner must interpret the claims in accordance with their literal wording, and to the extent the Examiner has not already done so, such is mandated now. If the Examiner relies upon allowance based upon language not appearing in the claims, the Examiner must reject the claims and suggest insertion of such language. Then, Applicants can respond as they deem appropriate.

Allowance of the claims as literally worded is urged. If the Examiner disagrees with this just stated position, claim rejections are mandated.

Applicant submits another substitute drawing request herewith. Applicant requests acceptance of the drawings.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/20/04

By: _____
James D. Shaurette
Reg. No. 39,833

PAGE 5/12 * RCVD AT 3/4/2004 1:06:55 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:5098383424 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-24